



City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor
Department of Planning and Development
D. M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 2400123
Applicant Name: Meredith Wirsching
Address of Proposal: 2501 Elliott Avenue

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Shoreline Substantial Development Permit for future interior alterations and change of use of an existing 102,652 sq. ft. light manufacturing building to 69,357 sq. ft. mini-warehouse, 28,945 sq. ft. warehouse and 4,754 sq. ft. administrative office. Project includes installation of two interior loading berths.

The following approval is required:

Variance to allow loading berths less than the standard size and quantity required by code. (SMC 23.54.035)

Variance to allow blank facades on a Class II Pedestrian Street in a DH2 zone. (SMC 23.49.332C)

Shoreline Substantial Development Permit – to allow development in the Urban Harborfront (UH) Shoreline Environment. (SMC 23.60)

SEPA - Environmental Determination - Chapter 25.05, Seattle Municipal Code (SMC)

SEPA DETERMINATION: ☐ Exempt ☒ DNS ☐ MDNS ☐ EIS

☒ DNS with conditions

☐ DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition or involving another agency with jurisdiction

BACKGROUND DATA

Site and Vicinity Description

The site is zoned Downtown Harborfront 2 with a 65 foot height limit (DH2-65). It is an upland lot of which only the western portion is within the Urban Harborfront (UH) Shoreline Environment. The site consists of a full block, bounded by Elliott Avenue to the east, Alaskan Way to the west, Vine Street to the north and Wall Street to the south. To the west of Alaskan way lies Elliott Bay. The site is rectangular in shape, approximately 119.9 feet wide and 240.06 feet in length, and is fully developed to the property lines with a building consisting of two abutting structures, now vacant, which were most recently used as a manufacturing and warehouse facility for Skyway Luggage.

Development in the vicinity consists of a mixture of mostly old and new commercial structures along the waterfront (Alaskan Way) and along Elliott Avenue. Properties immediately to the east, across Elliott Avenue, include the Belltown P-patch, a historic landmark known as the Belltown Cottages.

Proposal Description

The applicant proposes to change the use of an existing 102,652 sq. ft. light manufacturing building to 69,357 sq. ft. mini-warehouse, 28,945 sq. ft. warehouse and 4,754 sq. ft. administrative office.

The total building height and the footprint would remain the same. No expansion is proposed. The proposed change of use of the existing 102,652 sq. ft. space will mostly involve interior alterations. Exterior alterations proposed including improvements to Alaskan Way such as pavement, a public walkway, and installation of grasscrete. Some exterior windows are proposed to be covered for security purposes.

Public Comments

Four public comment letters were received during the comment period, which ended April 14, 2004. The letters expressed concern about any alterations proposed to the façades of the building along Vine Street and along Elliott Avenue.

ANALYSIS - VARIANCES

Pursuant to SMC 23.40.020 C, variances from the provisions or requirements of this Land Use Code shall be authorized when all the facts and conditions listed below are found to exist. Analysis of the variance requested follows each statement of the required facts and conditions.

The existing light manufacturing use does not provide any loading berths onsite. This is considered an existing nonconformity. The proposed change of use does not increase this nonconformity, therefore the requested variance for the number of loading berths required by code is not necessary. The request for variance from the loading berth size is still needed and is addressed below.

1. ***Because of unusual conditions applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, which were not created by the owner or applicant, the strict application of this Land Use Code would deprive the property of rights and privileges enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity;***

Variance #1 (Loading Berths)

The unusual conditions in this particular case are the location of the existing buildings, the topography, location and surroundings. The existing buildings occupy the entire site. The east side of the building is adjacent to Elliott Avenue, which is an arterial. There are no existing curbcuts along Elliott Avenue. The north and south sides of the site have a steep grade (13.5%) and the floor levels are such that vehicular access to the interior of the building is not feasible. The interior of the building can only be access at grade along the west side of the site, adjacent to Alaskan Way. Vehicle access is proposed at grade and where there is adequate head room to accommodate trucks. The area of the building that had adequate head room is only wide enough to accommodate two (2) truck loading berths, and only long enough to accommodate a 20 foot long truck. The remainder of the west side of the buildings does not have adequate headroom for trucks or does not have a floor level at grade. The portion of Alaskan Way adjacent to the site and usable for access, is only approximately 25 feet in width and given the maximum turning radius, the width of the right of way would only accommodate trucks 20 feet in length. Larger trucks would not be able to enter the building therefore there is no need for the loading berth to be greater than 20 in length. The grant of this variance will allow on-site loading activities generally available for other properties with similar uses in the vicinity.

Variance #2 (Blank Facades)

The existing grade and window placement make it impractical to meet the requirements for street level transparency along Wall Street. The location of existing floors and walls together with the existing slope along Wall Street creates a condition where only a few windows fall entirely within the street level transparency area of 2 feet to 8 feet about grade. The remainder of the windows only has small portions that fall within this area. With the exception of one window at the southeast corner, the windows do not provide eye level access into the existing floor levels and do not meet the intent of the code to provide visual access into the building.

2. ***The requested variance does not go beyond the minimum necessary to afford relief, and does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone in which the subject property is located;***

Variance #1 (Loading Berths)

The right of way between the railroad tracks and the buildings has historically been the location of loading activities. The activities were previously conducted at the exterior of the building, via a loading dock formerly located within the Alaskan Way right of way. There has never been an on-site loading area. Although the two new loading berths are not required to be provided by code, the applicant is choosing to provide them because they are vital for operation of the new warehouse use. Because of the condition of the existing structure, the location and size of these loading berths were limited. The requested size is the minimum necessary to accommodate the size of trucks proposed to use the facility.

Variance #2 (Blank Facades)

Given the placement of the window in relation to the existing grade and floor levels, it appears that the windows along Wall Street were never intended to provide street level transparency as required by the code today. Hence, covering the windows is not reducing the transparency. In addition, the request is not to remove the window, but to cover them in a way which could be reversed in the future. The covering of these windows is requested by the applicant to support the security and operation of the warehouse and mini-warehouse use. Although installation of display windows is a code complying option, due to the existing nonconforming design of the building, nonconformities are allowed to remain, hence effectively, transparency is only required for small portions of some of the existing windows.

3. ***The granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the zone or vicinity in which the subject property is located;***

Variance #1 (Loading Berths)

The west side of the building has historically been used for loading activity. Also, the trip calculations provided in the Traffic Analysis Memorandum, prepared by William Popp Associates on March 19, 2004, shows that the number of vehicle trips generated by the proposed uses is far less than the number of vehicle trips that would have been generated by the previous manufacturing use. Therefore, the impact to the neighborhood is being reduced. The commercial warehouse spaces are all of a fairly small size (<1000 sq. ft. each) and the demand for large truck loading areas is not anticipated.

Variance #2 (Blank Facades)

The existing building across the Wall Street is a parking garage. Covering the street level window will not affect its use or the people who use it. In addition, there are no other buildings along this block of Wall Street therefore there is no break in visual continuity along the street level.

Although the existing building has some transparency along Wall Street, it was built long before transparency requirements and is nonconforming to this development standard. The limited portions of windows existing within two and eight feet above Wall Street sidewalk grade contribute very little toward visual interest or providing “eyes on the street”. Therefore, removing these remnant elements of transparency will not be detrimental to the public welfare nor injurious to other properties or improvements in the zone or vicinity.

4. ***The literal interpretation and strict application of the applicable provisions or requirements of this Land Use Code would cause undue and unnecessary hardship or practical difficulties;***

Variance #1 (Loading Berths)

Given the limitations of on-grade access, headroom and turning radius, it is not practicable to meet the length requirements for either medium size or large size loading berths within the existing structure. In order to meet code requirements, the owner would be required to extensively restructure the building and/or excavate to create lower level loading areas. This is not practical due to the high water table. It would also be an unnecessary hardship with many practical difficulties.

Variance #2 (Blank Facades)

If the owner of the property is required to leave the existing window exposed, it will significantly reduce the security of the building, offering thieves and vandals easier access to items stored in the warehouse and/or mini-warehouse. If potential tenants perceive that the building is not secure, then the owner will have tremendous difficulty leasing the warehouse spaces and the project will not be viable. While display windows could be installed in the existing window openings, this alternative would not provide displays readily viewable from Wall Street due to existing fenestration patterns and existing sidewalk grade.

5. *The requested variance would be consistent with the spirit and purpose of the Land Use Code regulations for the area.*

Variance #1 (Loading Berths)

Loading is a function typically associated with a warehouse use. Although the area proposed to be used for loading does not meet the minimum size required by the Land Use Code, the requested size is appropriate based on the fact that larger trucks could not maneuver into the loading berths and loading could now take place on private property. Alaskan Way, the right of way adjacent to the building, has historically been used for loading activities. The historic berths have been removed, restoring the public right of way for public use.

Variance #2 (Blank Facades)

The spirit and purpose of the Land Use Code recognizes flexibility as one of the important goals to allow existing nonconformities to continue. And it allows existing non-conforming structures to not fully comply with current codes. Because of the placement of the existing windows, it appears that the windows were never intended to provide street level transparency as required by the code today. Covering some of these windows would allow for the needed security of the proposed warehouse and mini-warehouse, and would not make the structure effectively more non-conforming. The land use regulations also encourage the re-use of existing buildings by allowing nonconformities to remain, as does this proposal.

DECISION – VARIANCE:

Variance from SMC 23.54.035 to allow loading berths less than the standard size and quantity required by code is **APPROVED.**

Variance from SMC 23.49.332C to allow blank facades on Wall Street, a Class II Pedestrian Street in a DH2 zone is **APPROVED.**

ANALYSIS - SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Section 23.60.030 of the Seattle Municipal Code provides criteria for review of a shoreline substantial development permit and reads: *A substantial development permit shall be granted only when the development proposed is consistent with:*

- A. *The policies and procedures of Chapter 90.58 RCW;*

B. *The regulations of this Chapter; and*

C. *The provisions of Chapter 173-27 WAC*

Conditions may be attached to the approval of a permit as necessary to assure consistency of the proposed development with the Seattle Shoreline Master Program and the Shoreline Management Act.

A. The Policies and Procedures of Chapter 90.58 RCW

Chapter 90.58 RCW is known as the Shoreline Management Act of 1971. It is the policy of the state to provide for the management of the shorelines of the state by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses. This policy contemplates protecting against adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life, while protecting public rights of navigation and corollary incidental rights. Permitted uses in the shorelines shall be designed and conducted in a manner to minimize, insofar as practical, any resultant damage to the ecology and environment of the shoreline area and any interference with the public's use of the water.

The Shoreline Management Act provides definitions and concepts, and gives primary responsibility for initiating and administering the regulatory program of the Act to local governments. The Department of Ecology is to primarily act in a supportive and review capacity, with primary emphasis on insuring compliance with the policy and provisions of the Act. As a result of this Act, the City of Seattle and other jurisdictions with shorelines, adopted a local shoreline master program, codified in the Seattle Municipal Code at Chapter 23.60, that also incorporates the provisions of Chapter 173.27 WAC. Development on the shorelines of the state is not to be undertaken unless it is consistent with the policies and provisions of the Act and with the local master program. The Act sets out procedures, such as public notice and appeal requirements, and penalties for violating its provisions. As the following analysis will demonstrate, the subject proposal is consistent with the procedures outlined in RCW 90.58.

B. The Regulations of Chapter 23.60

Chapter 23.60 of the Seattle Municipal Code is known as the "Seattle Shoreline Master Program". In evaluating requests for substantial development permits, the Director must determine that a proposed use meets the approval criteria set forth in SMC 23.60.030 (cited above). Development standards of the shoreline environment and underlying zone must be considered, and a determination made as to any special requirements (shoreline conditional use, shoreline variance, or shoreline special use permit) or conditioning that is necessary to protect and enhance the shorelines area (SMC 23.60.064). In order to obtain a shoreline substantial development permit, the applicant must show that the proposal is consistent with the shoreline goals and policies established in SMC 23.60.004, and meets the development standards for all shoreline environments established in SMC 23.60.150 as well as the criteria and development standards for the shoreline environment in which the site is located; any applicable special approval criteria; and the development standards for specific uses.

The site is classified as an upland lot (SMC 23.60.924) and the proposed warehouse and offices are permitted uses in the Urban Harborfront (UH) environment (SMC 23.60.660). The proposed mini-warehouse use will be located in the portion of the building which is located outside of the UH environment. The proposal is also subject to the specific development standards established in the UH shoreline environment (SMC 23.60.690 - 704).

SMC 23.60.004 - Shoreline Policies

The Shoreline Goals and Policies which are part of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Element and the purpose and locational criteria for each shoreline environment designation contained in SMC 23.60.220 must be considered in making all decisions in the shoreline district. The purpose of the UH environment as set forth in SMC 23.60.220.C.8 is to *encourage economically viable water dependent uses to meet the needs of waterborne commerce, facilitate the revitalization of Downtown's waterfront, provide opportunities for public access and recreational enjoyment of the shoreline, preserve and enhance elements of historic and cultural significance and preserve views of Elliott Bay and land forms beyond.*

The proposed development will create offices and warehouse where manufacturing use is currently established. The development standards for structures in the DH2 zone deal with street façade requirements such as minimum façade height, façade setback limits, façade transparency requirements, blank façade limits and screening of parking. Most alterations are being made to the interior of the structure therefore most of these development standards will not apply to an existing building. The proposed development includes covering some exterior window on Wall Street with painted plywood. This requires a variance because it would decrease the existing façade transparency. Other exterior work includes improvements to Alaskan Way, the right of way located west of the site. Improvements include, pavement for driveway access, installation of grasscrete, installation of a pedestrian walkway and signage for public access. These improvements in the right of way will increase the opportunity for public access and enjoyment of the shoreline. These improvements in the public right of way must be installed prior to certificate of occupancy. The project will also be required to maintain all non-standard street improvements installed in the right of way.

SMC 23.60.064.- Procedures for Obtaining Shoreline Substantial Development Permits

The proposed project is a permitted use in the UH environment (SMC 23.60.660) and the underlying DH2 zoning district (SMC 23.49.318). As designed, the proposal conforms to the general development standards of the UH environment and the underlying DH2 zone.

SMC 23.60.152 - Development Standards for all Environments

These general standards apply to all uses in the various shoreline environments. They require that design and construction of all uses be conducted in an environmentally sound manner, consistent with the Shoreline Management Program and with best management practices for the specific use or activity. All shoreline development and uses must: 1) minimize and control any increases in surface water runoff so that the quality of receiving waters and shore properties are not adversely affected; 2) be located, designed, constructed, and managed in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts to surrounding land and water uses and is compatible with the affected area; and 3) be located, constructed, and operated so as not to be a hazard to public health and safety.

The proposed warehouse and administrative office uses are consistent with these general standards for development within the shoreline area. The proposal is subject to the standards established in the Stormwater, Grading, and Drainage Control Code which include provisions for erosion and sedimentation control both during construction and after occupancy of the building, thereby minimizing any adverse impact to water quality. The proposed structure design and lot location are similar to the surrounding structures and uses in the area. Finally, the building construction will be reviewed for conformity with applicable Codes governing public health and safety.

C. The Provisions of Chapter 173-27 WAC

WAC 173-27 establishes basic rules for the permit system to be adopted by local governments, pursuant to the language of RCW 90.58. It provides the framework for permits to be administered by local governments, including time requirements of permits, revisions to permits, notice of application, formats for permits, and provisions for review by the state's Department of Ecology (DOE). Since the Seattle Shoreline Master Program has been approved by DOE, consistency with the criteria and procedures of SMC Chapter 23.60 is also consistent with WAC 173-14 and RCW 90.58. As discussed in the foregoing analysis, the proposal is consistent with the criteria for a shoreline substantial development permit and may be approved.

DECISION - SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT

The Shoreline Substantial Development permit is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the annotated environmental checklist (dated, March 24, 2004), and supplemental information in the project file submitted by the applicant's agent. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information, and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, certain neighborhood plans, and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority.

The Overview Policy states, in part, "Where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation" subject to some limitations. Under such limitations/circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D1-7) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

Short-term Impacts

Construction Impacts

The following temporary or construction-related impacts are expected: minor decreased air quality due to suspended particulate from building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; conflict with normal pedestrian movement adjacent to the site; increased noise, and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources. Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction. The Street Use Ordinance requires debris to be removed from the street right-of-way, and includes regulations for maintaining circulation in the public right-of-way. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures in general. Finally, the Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that is permitted in the city. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most short-term impacts to the environment. Most of these impacts are minor in scope and are not expected to have significant adverse impacts (SMC 25.05. 794). However, due to the close proximity of neighboring residences and businesses, further analysis of construction impacts is warranted. The following is an analysis of the short-term impacts to the environment as well as mitigation.

Noise

Surrounding residential uses are likely to be slightly impacted by noise throughout the duration of construction. Due to the proximity of residential uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts. Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC.25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675B), additional mitigation is warranted.

To reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, construction activities shall generally be limited to non-holiday weekdays between 7:30 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby residences, only low noise impact work will be permitted on Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. and Sundays from 10:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

Hours on weekdays may be extended from 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M. on a case by case basis. All evening work must be approved by the DPD planner prior to each occurrence.

Construction on the individual enclosed floors can be done at other times in accordance with the Noise Ordinance. Such construction activities will have a minimal impact on residents living in the vicinity of the construction. Restricting the ability to conduct these tasks would extend the construction schedule, thus the duration of associated noise impacts.

DPD recognizes that there may be occasions when critical construction activities could be performed in the evenings and on weekends, which are of an emergency nature or related to issues of safety, or which could substantially shorten the total construction time frame if conducted during these hours. Therefore, the hours may be extended and/or specific types of construction activities may be permitted on a case by case basis by approval of the Land Use Planner (Darlene Edwards 206-684-5606) prior to each occurrence. Periodic monitoring of work activity and noise levels may be conducted by DPD.

Parking Demand During Construction

Parking on adjacent streets is highly utilized, with peak utilization during the day and occasionally the evening hours. Short term adverse impacts to on-street parking availability is expected due to additional parking requirements for construction workers, materials and equipment. SEPA policies preclude mitigating the development on parking availability in Downtown Seattle. (25.05.6752b)

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are not anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased bulk and scale on the site; noise, traffic or parking in the area; demand for public services and utilities; and light and glare.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: the Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code which requires on site collection of stormwater with provisions for controlled tight line release to an approved outlet and may require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding; the City Energy Code which will require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows; and the Land Use Code which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, due to the location of this proposal, additional land use impacts which may have long term affects are discussed below.

Parking

The Downtown Code 23.49.016 2A allows an exception to parking requirements in that no parking shall be required for new uses to be located in existing structures, or when existing structures are remodeled. Furthermore, 25.05.675M2B states that no SEPA authority is provided to mitigate the impact of development on parking availability in the downtown zones.

Historic Preservation

Under adopted SEPA policies, conditioning for impact mitigation for historic preservation can occur under three scenarios: potential designation of this building as a Landmark, mitigation for impacts on an adjacent Landmark, and disturbance of a possible archeological site. Two of these scenarios are discussed below.

The Department of Neighborhoods (DON) has determined that it is unlikely that the buildings on-site would meet the standards for designation as individual landmarks (per LPB259/04).

The DON has also reviewed this project proposal because it is located across the street from a City Landmark known as the Belltown Cottages at 2512, 2512S and 2516 Elliott Avenue. Since the Elliott Avenue elevation of this project faces the Belltown Cottages, the DON encourages that the applicant retain the window along Elliott Avenue as windows. If infill of these windows is necessary, the applicant is encouraged to infill the windows in a reversible manner, so that infill would be easily removable and the windows could be restored in the future (per LPB 260/04). Infill of any existing windows within two and eight feet of the sidewalk on Elliott Avenue would conflict with DH2 façade requirements, and is not part of this proposal.

Traffic

A condensed traffic analysis summary was prepared by William Popp, Jr. of William Popp and Associates, dated March 19, 2004.

According to the ITE Trip generation manual 6th edition, the existing manufacturing use would generate 441 average weekday daily, 84 AM and 86 PM peak hour trips into the surrounding street system. The proposed use is estimated to generate 247 average weekday daily, 15 AM and 27 PM peak hour trips. The new net trips to/from the site as a result of the removal of the potential site use traffic is estimated to be a reduction of 184 weekday daily trips, 69 AM and 59 PM peak hour trips. In summary, the vehicle trips estimated for the proposed project will be less than the current building's potential vehicle trips. Thus, the noted traffic-related impacts are not considered significant.

DECISION - SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official, on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- [X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(C).
- [] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).

CONDITIONS - SHORELINE

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

1. Complete improvements for Alaskan Way right-of-way as shown on Master User Permit plans and as approved by Seattle Department of Transportation.

For the life of the project

2. Maintain all non-standard improvements in Alaskan Way right-of-way unless otherwise directed by Seattle Department of Transportation.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

During Construction

The following condition(s) to be enforced during construction shall be posted at the site in a location on the property line that is visible and accessible to the public and to construction personnel from the street right of way. The conditions will be affixed to placards prepared by DPD. The placards will be issued along with the building permit set of plans. The placards shall be laminated with clear plastic or other weatherproofing material and shall remain in place for the duration on construction.

The owner(s) and/or responsible party(s) shall:

3. To reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, construction activities shall generally be limited to non-holiday weekdays between 7:30 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby residences, work will be permitted on Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. and Sundays from 10:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Construction work proposed outside these established hours must be approved by the DPD planner (Darlene Edwards (206) 684-5606) prior to each occurrence. Construction on the individual enclosed floors can be done at other times in accordance with the Noise Ordinance.

Signature: (signature on file) Date: November 11, 2004
Darlene Edwards, Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development